1	
2	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA
3	FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
4	STATE OF ALASKA,)
5	Plaintiff,)
6	vs.)
7	ISHMAEL JONATHAN SERGIE,)
8	Defendant.)
9	Case No. 4BE-21-00205CR
10	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF BAIL HEARING
12	
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE NATHANIEL PETERS Superior Court Judge
14	Bethel, Alaska
15	August 10, 2021 8:37 a.m.
16	APPEARANCES:
17	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: IZAAK BRUCE Bethel County District
18	Attorney 204 Eddie Hoffman Highway
19	Bethel, Alaska
20	FOR THE DEFENDANT: EMILY L. JURA Bethel County Public
21	Defender's Office 460 Ridgecrest, Suite 217
22	PO Box 10 Bethel, Alaska
23	
24	
25	

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1

1			TABLE O	F CONTENTS		
2	BAIL HEARIN	IG:				Page 3
3	<u>WITNESSES</u> :	VOL	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
4	FOR THE DEF	ENDANT:				
5	Kenneth And	lrews I	6	11	11	
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
	i					

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

2

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 Courtroom 5 8:31:33 3 THE COURT: All right. We're not on record, State of 5 Alaska vs. Ishmael Sergie, case number 4BE-210205CR. This 6 time is set for a bail hearing. This is Judge Peters in 7 Bethel. Do we have a district attorney on the phone? Yes, Your Honor. This is Isaak Bruce. 8 MR. BRUCE: 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bruce. 10 And do we have Ms. Jura representing Mr. Sergie? MS. JURA: Yes, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Thank you. And we've got Ishmael joining 13 us from the Kenai Youth Facility. Do we have the victim 14 or the victim's representative on the phone? Okay. 15 Anybody else on the phone for Mr. Sergie's case? 16 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. Jason Andrews in Akiak. 17 THE COURT: Sorry, that was Jason (phonetic) Andrews? 18 MR. ANDREWS: Yes. THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Andrews, how are you 19 20 related to this case? 2.1 MR. ANDREWS: He's my nephew, and I was --22 THE COURT: Oh, were you approved to be --23 MR. ANDREWS: -- going to be a third party. 24 THE COURT: -- a third party? 25 MR. ANDREWS: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Okay. Great, thank you.
2	MR. ANDREWS: Yes, I was.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else on the phone?
4	MR. R. ANDREWS: Ronald (phonetic) Andrews.
5	MR. K. ANDREWS: Kenneth Andrews.
6	THE COURT: I heard another Andrews. Who was the
7	other Andrews?
8	MR. R. ANDREWS: Ronald Andrews.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Andrews is
10	MR. R. ANDREWS: From Akiak.
11	THE COURT: yep. Also approved as a third party
12	previously. And there was somebody else on the phone?
13	MR. K. ANDREWS: Kenneth Andrews.
14	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Andrews, how are you
15	related to this case?
16	MR. K. ANDREWS: Ishmael is my son.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Anybody else on the phone
18	whose name the Court hasn't called yet? Okay.
19	And Mr. Bruce, did the State make victim
20	notification?
21	MR. BRUCE: Yes, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Very good. And are the parties
23	ready to proceed at this time, Mr. Bruce?
24	MR. BRUCE: The State's prepared, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Jura?
	eScribers, LLC (973) 406-2250

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	MR. BRUCE: Yes, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jura, I think the burden is on
3	the Defense, so who are you going to call?
4	MS. JURA: Your Honor, I'm going to call Kenneth
5	Andrews.
6	THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Andrews, if you can raise
7	your right hand.
8	KENNETH ANDREWS
9	called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, testified
10	telephonically as follows on:
11	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead and put your right hand
12	down. If you can state and spell your first and last name
13	for the record.
14	MR. K. ANDREWS: Kenneth Andrews, K-E-N-N-E-T-H,
15	A-N-D-R-E-W-S.
16	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And you're
17	calling in from Akiak today, you said?
18	MR. K. ANDREWS: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: And you're Ishmael's dad?
20	MR. K. ANDREWS: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. The parties are going
22	to get to ask you some questions. I might have a couple
23	follow-up questions after they're done.
24	So Ms. Jura, whenever you're ready.
25	MS. JURA: Okay. Thank you.

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. JURA: Mr. Andrews, can you hear me okay? 3 Yes, ma'am. А 5 Okay. Great. Mr. Andrews, was Ishmael living with 6 you before his arrest? 7 Α Yes. Okay. And were you and are you the one responsible 8 9 for feeding him, clothing him, giving him shelter? 10 Α Yes. 11 Okay. And does Ishmael have any money, to your 12 knowledge? Not that I know of right now. I mean -- yeah, not 13 Α 14 that I know of. 15 Okay. Has he ever had a job? 0 16 Α No. 17 Q Okay. Does he have a checking account? 18 I think he does, but I'm not too sure. Α Okay. Assuming he has a checking account, would 19 20 there be any money in it? Most likely not. 2.1 Α 22 Okay. And would that be because Ishmael, one, has never had a job, doesn't have an income? 23 24 А Yes. 25 Okay. And does he own anything? Does he own any

1 property, does he own any assets, anything like that? 2 Α No. Okay. And Mr. Andrews, are you the person who earns 3 an income for the household? 5 Α Yes. 6 Okay. Before I get into that, who all lives in the 7 household with you and with Ishmael? 8 My four other boys, my daughter, and my wife. Α 9 Okay. So there's five other kids in addition to Ishmael? 10 11 Α Yes. 12 Okay. And are they all under the age of 18? 13 Α Yes. Okay. And then you mentioned your wife; does she 14 Q 15 have a job or an income? 16 Α No. 17 Q Okay. And what is your job? 18 My job is I'm a tribal police officer. Α 19 Okay. And about how many hours do you work? 0 20 Α I work eight hours a day. 2.1 Okay. So regular full-time job? Q 22 Α Yes. 23 Okay. And what is -- what -- do you get paid a Q 24 Do you get paid an hourly wage? salary? 25 Α \$20 an hour.

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

7

- 1 Q \$20 an hour?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q Okay. And then, do you get paid weekly, bi-weekly?
- 4 A Every two weeks.
- 5 Q Okay. And so is one paycheck, roughly, \$1,500 or so?
- 6 A Less than that; it's, like, 13.
- 7 Q 1,300. Okay. And so total income for the family of 8 seven, including Ishmael, a month, is less than 3,000?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Okay. And do you all live in a house?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And is that a house that you own, or is it a house 13 that you're buying? How -- do you --
- 14 A It's a house I'm buying. Like, I'm paying \$100 a
 15 month.
- Q Okay. And who are you buying it from?
- 17 A AVCP Housing Authority.
- Q Okay. And that's a housing program to help people become homeowners eventually?
- 20 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And right now, you couldn't sell the house or leverage the house?
- 23 A No. No.
- Q Okay. And Mr. Andrews, do you owe any money to anybody currently?

- 1 A Probably just to our local store.
- 2 Q To the store. Okay. About how much money do you owe
- 3 | to the store?
- A My last bill, like, 12,000 something.
- 5 Q Did you say 12,000?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Okay. So quite a bit. And do you have any savings?
- 8 A Savings, no. No savings.
- 9 Q Okay. And so in terms of your income, would it be 10 fair to say that you live paycheck to paycheck?
- 11 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And so let's say it's two days before you get
- paid next, is there going to be any money in your bank account?
- A Yeah, no. My bank right now is currently negative \$30.
- Q Okay. And so with your income, the 1,300 or so that
- 17 you make every two weeks, does that pay for all the needs of
- 18 | all six of your children?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Food, heating, clothes, all that?
- 21 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And just give me an idea about food. How much
- does food cost you a month?
- A Not really too sure. It's quite a bit.
- Q Can be high, yeah. And that's okay if you don't have

1 a -- if you don't have an estimate, that's fine. 2 Yeah. I don't have a --Okay. Mr. Andrews, do you also -- do you engage in 3 0 subsistence to provide food for your family? 4 5 Α Yes. 6 Okay. And is that an important part of providing for 7 your family? 8 Α Yes. 9 Okay. And do you have equipment that helps with 10 that, boats or snow machines? I have -- I have a motor, just a motor. And I'm 11 Α 12 using my wife's nephew's boat right -- borrowing it --13 Q Okay. 14 Α -- right now. 15 Okay. So you have a motor. And then anything else? 0 Any snow machines, or anything? 16 17 Α I bought two -- two snow boats (phonetic), but one's 18 not running right now. 19 Okay. Are those things -- do they help you provide 20 assistance for the family? 2.1 Α Yes. 22 0 Okay. 23 MS. JURA: Okay. I don't think I have any other 24 questions for you, Mr. Andrews. Thank you. 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

10

1	Mr. Bruce, any questions for Mr. Andrews?
2	MR. BRUCE: Just one, Your Honor.
3	KENNETH ANDREWS
4	testified as follows on:
5	CROSS EXAMINATION
6	BY MR. BRUCE:
7	Q Mr. Andrews, how long have you been employed as a
8	tribal police officer?
9	A March or October 24th, 2018.
10	Q And what's your current role in the Akiak Police
11	Department?
12	A I just my shift was (indiscernible - background
13	noise).
14	Q Okay. Thank you, very much.
15	THE COURT: All right. Ms. Jura, any follow-up
16	questions?
17	MS. JURA: Your Honor, I just have one area that I
18	forgot if I could just do it really quickly.
19	KENNETH ANDREWS
20	testified as follows on:
21	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. JURA:
23	Q Mr. Andrews, does A.N live in Akiak?
24	A Who?
25	Q The alleged victim in this case, A.N.
	eScribers, LLC (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net www.escribers.net 11

1	A No.
2	Q Okay. Does she have any family in Akiak?
3	A Not that I know of.
4	Q Okay. All right. Thank you.
5	MS. JURA: I don't have any other questions.
6	THE COURT: Okay. And Mr. Bruce, any re-cross based
7	on that?
8	MR. BRUCE: No, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Jura, any other
10	evidence or witnesses?
11	MS. JURA: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bruce, any evidence or
13	witnesses?
14	MR. BRUCE: Not at this time, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Well, then the Court will hear
16	argument, Ms. Jura.
17	MS. JURA: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor. So as I'm
18	sure the Court is aware after reading the bail order, this
19	Court has an obligation to set bail at the least
20	restrictive necessary to make sure that this particular
21	Defendant, Mr. Sergie, A, comes to court, and B, doesn't
22	hurt anybody.
23	So that means that we have to consider this
24	particular Defendant; his finances, his background, his
25	character, and narrowly tailor the bail conditions so that

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net 12

they're the least restrictive to assure those things -- to reasonably assure those things.

2.1

The evidence that we presented today is that Mr. Sergie has, essentially, no money and no assets, no income. And the evidence is that his dad, who is his caretaker, his guardian, that the most he -- and I apologize. I didn't actually as Mr. Andrews this, but the money that we're proposing today that this family could afford is \$1,000.

And so that is basically what Mr. Andrews would scrape together from his paychecks. And that is the most that he could do without harming his family. And I apologize; I didn't ask him that. I could -- if the Court wants to hear that from his own mouth, I could. But that's the amount that he discussed with me that he could afford.

He lives paycheck to paycheck. He has six dependents, five that he's taking of right now with Mr. Sergie incarcerated. This entire family lives off less than \$3,000 a month, and an income that has high cost of living. And basically, \$1,000 is a significant amount to this family, that is more than a third of their monthly income.

And so that's an amount that Mr. Sergie's going to be motivated to get back for his family, and for him to live

off of, and that's the most that can be posted. And so we're either asking that the Court set bail at zero dollars, in recognition of the fact that Mr. Sergie, himself, has no money; or alternatively, we're asking that this Court set bail at \$1,000, which is the most that his father, who is his custodian, would be able to get together.

2.1

And I think -- from all the bail opinions that have come out recently, I think it's pretty clear that the Court should start its analysis with what Mr. Sergie can post, or alternatively what his custodian could post for him.

And in order for this Court to set a bail -- bail amount that's higher than that, the Court would need a particularized reason for finding that that higher amount does something that \$1,000 wouldn't do.

And it has to consider it in light of all the other bail conditions that are in place, including these very restrictive 24 hour monitoring conditions from third party custodians, not to go to the river, not to have any access to the river, in light of the fact that A.N. isn't in Akiak, doesn't have family in Akiak.

And so the Court can't just set bail at an amount that sounds high or sounds good. It has to really consider what is significant for Mr. Sergie, what is going

to incentivize him, and beyond that is excessive.

2.1

And also, if the Court were to set bail at an amount higher than \$1,000, and have a particularized reason for that, that reason also needs to be reasonable and not speculative. And the difference between what is reasonable and what is speculative turns on logic.

And one example that I found helpful was in the Wagner (phonetic) bail order where it talks about the judge in that case was concerned that the release plan wouldn't necessarily protect the community at large even though the alleged victim in that case lived far away.

And the court said that it was speculative to conclude that the defendant, who had no other criminal history, would represent a danger to the community at large based on the allegations that he had had a particularized situation with one person.

And so that's how tight, I think, reasonable logic has to be. Is you can't just assume the worst simply because somebody is charged with serious charges. Here, Mr. Sergie has no criminal history. And I realize he's young, but he also has no juvenile history.

He has none of the red flags that I think we sometimes see in cases, such as resisting arrest, trying to flee, trying to contact the alleged victim in the case while in jail either through letters or through third

parties.

2.1

So none of that -- those red flags of -- to have a particularized reason for thinking that Mr. Sergie won't follow the Court's orders. Certainly, you know, the charges are serious. And so we need guardrails in place; but I don't think we have those indications that Mr. Sergie is going blow past all the guardrails, hell-bent on breaking the law.

I don't think that there's any particularized reason in this case for setting bail beyond what Mr. Sergie can afford, which his zero dollars; or at most, what his father can afford, which is \$1,000. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Bruce, State's position and any position of A.N.

MR. BRUCE: Your Honor, based on our victim contact, the victim's guardian is opposed to the release at this point. Your Honor, I'll note -- I'll begin to make several notes. First, Your Honor, Defense counsel presented no evidence specifically as to why \$1,000 was appropriate.

I'll also note, Your Honor, that in this case there are red flags and (indiscernible) concerned about the danger to the victim. The victim lives in Kwethluk, Your Honor, that's approximately ten miles away from Akiak, so it's a very short distance overall, Your Honor.

I also note that in this case we're dealing with a relatively prolonged history of abuse with multiple cases of sexual assaults where he forced her to have sex; at least on one occasion strangled her to unconsciousness in addition to hitting her multiple times and assaulting her — hitting her with a rifle.

2.1

There was also another occasion where he pointed a rifle at her. He has also made threats to her that he would get after her, which the victim interpreted as saying he would strangle her again; and that specifically made as a threat that he would report this.

I also note, Your Honor, that there is some concern about local law enforcement in the area given that much of this abuse occurred in the home of Mr. Kenneth, who is a local tribal police officer. In light of that, Your Honor, I believe that bail as currently set is appropriate given the particularized danger to the victim.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Ms. Jura, final argument.

MS. JURA: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll try to be brief. And first, I just wanted to respond to the factual assertion of ten miles away. There are no roads that go between these two villages.

So when we're talking about ten miles away, we're talking about somebody either hoofing it on foot or

getting in a boat, and in a boat it's 25 water miles; and so these are significant distances. This is not just hopping in a car and driving for ten minutes.

2.1

As to the State's substantive argument that there's a particularized danger here, I didn't hear the State articulate any reason for why \$25,000 addresses a concern that \$1,000 doesn't, and that is what they need to do at this point.

This Court starts its analysis by looking at what Mr. Sergie and his family can afford. And only if there is some reason to go beyond that can the Court go beyond that; and the State failed to articulate anything other than just, again, asserting that these are scary and serious charges.

But nothing about \$25,000 is a magic number that protects A.N. any more than \$1,000. The point is, what incentivizes Mr. Sergie? We presented the evidence that this is an indigent family with very little resources, and that the most that his father would be able to scrape together is \$1,000, and that that will provide the incentive for Mr. Sergie, in addition to the full-time monitoring, the distance, and all the other parameters that are in place. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Well, I think what the Court mentioned last time was that the Court

needs to consider the appearance of the Defendant, the safety of the victim, the safety of the public in general.

2.1

Generally, this Court isn't too concerned about the appearance of defendants unless, as Ms. Jura pointed out, there's some history of escape, or resisting, or flight; and Mr. Sergie, I don't think has that.

And generally, this Court isn't, again, too concerned unless there -- a defendant has a history of fleeing, doing something to actively avoid arrest, something like that along those lines. And frankly, we don't have that in this case, and the Court's not concerned about Mr. Sergie's appearance in court.

He's a lifelong resident, I think, of the area. I think he's 16, 17 years old. He's -- the Court doesn't have any information he's lived any place else. His family's here. We heard from his dad today that he's in Akiak, and a TPO in Akiak.

We heard from his grandfather and his uncle last time; they're both calling in from Akiak again today. And I think they were in Akiak the last time as well. So appearance isn't the issue or the -- what the Court is concerned with. And the safety of the public in general, the Court really isn't concerned with.

The Court is concerned with the safety for A.N. and her family. As the Court pointed out last time, this

wasn't a one-time incident. And as the State pointed out today, this wasn't a one-time incident involving a scary incident and very serious allegations.

I'm reading from the affidavit in support of the complaint. "A.N. stated approximately four" -- and I'm on page 2 of the complaint.

"A.N. stated approximately four weeks ago
Ishmael forced her to have sex. And she said, no, please,
no. A.N. indicated that Ishmael forced her to have sex
anyway at that time and assaulted her.

A.N. has articulated multiple past incidents -instances where Ishmael follows the same pattern of
assaultive behavior, usually staring with an angry,
annoyed face and a growl. This generally progresses to
Ishmael strangling her, slapping her, hitting her legs,
and throwing objects at her.

A.N. recalled that on or about March 3rd, 2021, Ishmael had a similar pattern of annoyed growling behavior that led to Ishmael shooting a .30-06 rifle and a 20-gauge shotgun near her before pointing a .410 shotgun directly at her head.

A.N. thought Ishmael would shoot her in the head, but he eventually put the shotgun down. A.N. recalled that Ishmael had threatened to kill her multiple times in the past. Ishmael has told A.N. that if she reports his

assaults, he would take her out in the woods, tie her up, and kill her, or leave her to die.

2.1

After learning that A.N. cares about her siblings, he has threatened to kill them or A.N.'s parents if she does not comply with his wishes. This pattern of fear and assaults led A.N. to play along and not resist Ishmael's sexual assaults on March 8th, 2021."

Taking into consideration what -- and there's kind of two arguments, I think, from the Defense -- sort of alternative arguments. One is that he should be released third party to his grandfather and his uncle without any bail since that's what he can afford is zero dollars.

The Court, looking at that perspective, what he can post and what his custodians can post, the Court doesn't believe that zero dollars is appropriate or incentivizes Ishmael to follow the rules.

Third parties -- while the Court approved third parties and thought the third parties would do their job, third parties only have to report Ishmael if he violates conditions of release; they don't have to physically stop him or prohibit him from violating.

If he gets in a boat and drives away, they need to call the police, who's their brother and son, or some other law enforcement to report Ishmael; they don't have to physically stop him.

Third parties have never been required to stop. And while right now it's 20 or 25 miles, I think, via the river, in another couple months it's going to be frozen, and a much quicker ride, generally, on snow machine.

2.1

The Court heard today from Mr. Andrews that they've got a couple SNO-GO -- snow machines, one of which isn't working at this time. But the trip from Akiak to Kwethluk, I think, via SNO-GO is generally a pretty short ride.

And if Ishmael gets it in his head that he's going to take retribution on A.N. or her family, like he's said he's done, he wouldn't need much lead time to get there and accomplish what he's said in the past he's going to do, which is take A.N. out to the woods, tie her up, kill her, or leave her to die, or else take some other action against A.N.'s siblings or her family, her parents.

So the Court doesn't believe that zero dollars incentivizes Ishmael to follow the Court's instructions. Again, if we didn't have this other -- these other allegations that he's threatened her in the past, the Court would be more inclined to reduce the bail down to either OR or reduce it down even more from 25,000.

But given that Ishmael has said in the past that he will kill her, hurt her siblings, hurt her family as she reports, now that she's reported, the Court doesn't

believe that zero dollars is appropriate to take that risk since he has articulated that he will, again, take revenge or retribution against A.N. if she reports.

2.1

Now that she's reported, I don't think the Court should take that chance and hope that Ishmael's not going to follow through when he's said in the past that he will, sort of, make good on his promises when he's talking to A.N.

He hasn't done anything to the Court -- the Court hasn't heard anything new other than what's in the affidavit. So the Court's going to make the same findings and rulings as to the \$1,000 as well.

The Court does not believe that \$1,000 posted by Mr. Sergie's family incentivizes him to follow the Court's rules, especially in light of what he has said in the past about what he's going to do to A.N. if A.N. reports.

Again, now that she has reported, the Court has great concerns that he's going to follow through or attempt to follow through to harm A.N. And again, he has not done anything that the Court's aware of since he's been in jail.

Ms. Jura's correct; the Court hasn't heard anything that he has attempted to call her, or contact her, or send her letters, or attempted to persuade her in any way to drop the charges.

Sometimes the Court does hear about that, and that just makes the State's argument stronger to prohibit release. But in this case, A.N. has stated that on multiple past instances Ishmael has done this to her and threatened her to kill her multiple times.

2.1

She says A.N. recalled that Ishmael has threatened to kill her multiple times in the past. And the Court doesn't want to take the chance that these are idle threats and believes that when somebody say something that they mean to potentially follow through.

So the Court's going to deny the request to reduce it down to zero dollars, or down to \$1,000, even taking into account what Ishmael can post and what his family can post at this point in time.

Again, if this were just a one-time incident, the Court would be more inclined. But given Ishmael's statements to A.N., his past threats to A.N., the Court's going to deny the request.

If -- the Court, I think, would look at a different analysis if A.N. were in Anchorage, if A.N. were going to school -- sometimes teenagers here in the Delta go to school at Mt. Edgecumbe. And if there was some information that she was, sort of, a jet ride away where he'd have to come to Bethel, and board a plane, and then fly to Anchorage or Fairbanks, I think we'd have even a

different analysis at that point in time.

2.1

But being the next village up or down the river, I don't believe zero dollars release, or even \$1,000 release satisfies the Court that it protects A.N. and her siblings and family, again, given the multiple threats that Ishmael has made against her in the past.

So the Court's going to keep the bail as previously set, \$25,000 plus the third party to Ronald and Jason Andrews with the conditions the Court imposed on June 24th, 2021.

Again, the Court is taking into consideration the finances of Ishmael and his family. But the Court's also taking into consideration the threats that Ishmael has made against A.N. on, apparently, multiple -- multiple threats that he's made in the past.

Anything else from the State's perspective at this point in time, Mr. Bruce?

MR. BRUCE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bruce, any other findings that the State thinks it might need if this is appealed?

MR. BRUCE: Not at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Jura, any questions about the Court's findings, and any findings you think the Court needs to make for appellate purposes if Ishmael wants to appeal again?

MS. JURA: Yes. My request is that the Court explain why \$25,000 provides that assurance that the Court doesn't think \$1,000 provides.

THE COURT: YeaOh. Well, the -- it's obviously a scale. And you know, what would \$25,000 do that \$24,000 do; I don't know, Ms. Jura. And I think that's difficult to answer. And probably possible to answer is when does that, sort of, dollar amount happen?

Is \$1,001 appropriate, or \$1,002? That's hard to explain. The Court does not believe that \$1,000 is appropriate given the allegations that Ishmael has made repeated multiple threats. And I don't know if I can really articulate why exactly.

And again, maybe the Court of appeals will reverse me again, and send it back. But I don't know exactly why 25,000 -- it's hard to articulate why, exactly, 25,000 as opposed to 2,250. If the proposal was 2,250, I don't know what I would do.

We need to come up with a number. I'm coming up with a number, if somebody wants to propose 20,000, I might, you know, be able to accept 20,000. I'm just saying I don't believe that 1,000 is appropriate.

So I don't know if that really answers or gives you what you want, but I just don't think \$1,000 is appropriate. So the court of appeals might send it back

and say I need to do more as to why 25,000 is appropriate.

Again, if you want me to say 20,000, I'll reduce it down to 20,000. I think that might be appropriate, but I just don't think 1,000 is, if that makes sense. Again, I -- you know, I've read the opinions, too.

And every time I read the bail opinions, I don't know what to think or say, because they're asking -- the court of appeals, it seems like, is asking for the Court to set an exact number and say why exactly that number would work but \$1 less wouldn't. And again, I don't know if I can articulate that. So anything else?

MS. JURA: No, Your Honor.

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Then, the bail will remain as set. We'll leave it at 25,000 plus third parties to Ronald and Jason Andrews, plus the conditions from June 24th.

When is our next court date? Let's see. Looks like September 16th at 11; is that correct? Okay. Well, it looks like it's September 16th at 11. We will get Ishmael on the phone from, at this point in time, Kenai Youth Facility.

Obviously, Ms. Jura, if that changes, then you can let us know. If you hear that he's someplace else, you can let us know if we need to do an order for him to appear by phone, or if they'll just call in. We'd

1	appreciate that. Okay?
2	MS. JURA: Okay.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. So we'll
4	go off record in Ishmael's case. Thank you, everyone, for
5	calling in. Thank you to the Andrews for calling in.
6	Ishmael, give Ms. Jura a call with any questions.
7	Okay?
8	THE DEFENDNAT: Okay.
9	THE COURT: All right. Thank you. All right. We'll
10	stand in recess. The parties are excused at this time in
11	Ishmael's case. Everyone is free to hang up on Ishmael's
12	case.
13	(Proceedings concluded at 9:04 a.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Nicole Ferguson, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 28 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of proceedings in Case No. 4BE-21-00205CR, State Of Alaska v. Ishmael Jonathan Sergie, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic sound recording to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Nicole Ferguson, CDLT-149

Transcriber

8/13/2021

Date